

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8

9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 DAVID CHAD GLOW,

No. C-05-1933 MMC

12 Plaintiff,

**ORDER GRANTING JOINT MOTION TO  
13 TRANSFER VENUE**

v.

14 UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY  
15 and HOWARD REDMOND,

Defendants.

16 \_\_\_\_\_ /  
17

18 The Court is in receipt of the parties' Joint Status Statement, filed June 6, 2008, in which  
19 the parties request that the Court "consolidate" the instant action with a related action pending  
20 in the Eastern District of California ("Eastern District"), and that such "consolidated action"  
21 proceed in the Eastern District. (See Joint Status Statement at 2:12-14.) The Court construes  
22 said request as a joint motion to transfer the instant action to the Eastern District for the  
23 convenience of the parties, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), in light of overlapping issues  
24 regarding plaintiff's alleged injury and damages, and in the interest of judicial economy.

25 So construed, and good cause appearing for the relief requested, the joint motion is

26 //

27 //

28 //

1 hereby GRANTED, and the instant action is hereby transferred to the Eastern District.<sup>1</sup>

2 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

3 Dated: June 9, 2008

*Maxine M. Chesney*  
4 MAXINE M. CHESNEY  
United States District Judge

5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

---

27 <sup>1</sup> To the extent the parties seek the additional relief of consolidation of the two  
actions, the Court defers to the transferee court with respect to such issue, and,  
28 accordingly, denies the parties' request to consolidate, without prejudice to the parties  
raising the issue, by appropriate motion, in the Eastern District.